



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,549	12/07/2004	Akihiko Ito	112857-489	6863
29175 7590 08/20/2008 BELI., BOYD & LLOYD, LLP P. O. BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690				
EXAMINER				
GILLIS, BRIAN J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2141				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/20/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/517,549

Applicant(s)

ITO ET AL.

Examiner

Brian J. Gillis

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 47-92 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 47-92 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-850)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01132005 and 05212008

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 89 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim depends from cancelled claim 42. The Examiner interprets this as a typographical error and for examination purposes assumes dependency from claim 88. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 51-53, 56, 57, 59, 60, 64-69, and 90-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 51 recites the limitation "the address information" in lines 3-4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 51 recites the limitation "the entity" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 52 recites the limitation "the first access means" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 56 recites the limitation "the search means" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 57 recites the limitation "the search means" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 59 recites the limitation "the program information" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 60 recites the limitation "the program information" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 64 recites the limitation "the content" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 65 recites the limitation "the content" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 66 recites the limitation "the content" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 67 recites the limitation "the content" in lines 2 and 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 68 recites the limitation "the content" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 69 recites the limitation "the content" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 90 recites the limitation "the content" in lines 2 and 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 91 recites the limitation "the content" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 92 recites the limitation "the content" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

As for claim 53, which claims dependency from claim 52, this claim is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis per the rationale of claim 52.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 47-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed information access system is software per se. Please refer to MPEP 2106.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 47-51, 58-64, 70-74, and 81-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shoff et al (US Patent #6,240,555).

(Claim 47 discloses) an information access system capable of distributing program meta information and a content with an interrelation established therebetween, the information access system comprising: transmission means for transmitting the program meta information and a meta information reference ID from an information distribution device to an information reception device (Shoff et al shows transmitting the

episode program guide information with pointers to the viewer computing unit (column 5, line 61 – column 6, line 6 and column 7, lines 1-8.); reception means for receiving the program meta information and the meta information reference ID from the information distribution device (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing device received the episode information and pointers (column 7, lines 1-8.)); request means for requesting content meta information to the information distribution device based on the meta information reference ID received by the reception means (Shoff et al shows additional related information is retrieved using the pointer (column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 8 and column 9, lines 20-29.)); distribution means for distributing the content meta information to the information reception device in response to the request made by the request means (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data which is distributed from a headend or an independent service provider (column 7, lines 51-60.)); and display means for displaying the content meta information acquired from the information distribution device (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit displays the requested information (column 7, lines 9-18 and column 10, lines 34-43)).

(Claim 48 discloses) the information access system according to claim 47, wherein the reception means receives the program meta information and the meta information reference ID over a network (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data over a network (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 49 discloses) the information access system according to claim 47, wherein the reception means receives the program meta information and the meta

information reference ID over a broadcast wave (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data wirelessly (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 50 discloses) the information access system according to claim 47, wherein the content meta information received based on the meta information reference ID includes address information of an entity of the content (Shoff et al shows the pointers refer to the location of video data (column 5, line 61- column 6, line 6)).

(Claim 51 discloses) the information access system according to claim 49, further comprising first content access means for making an access to the content based on the address information of the entity of the content (Shoff et al shows the data is retrieved using the information in the pointer (column 8, line 56 – column 9, line 8, and column 9, lines 20-29)).

(Claim 58 discloses) an information distribution device capable of distributing program meta information and a content with an interrelation established therebetween, the information distribution device comprising: transmission means for transmitting the program meta information and a meta information reference ID to an information reception device (Shoff et al shows transmitting the episode program guide information with pointers to the viewer computing unit (column 5, line 61 – column 6, line 6 and column 7, lines 1-8).); reception means for receiving a request for content meta information from the information reception device based on the meta information reference ID (Shoff et al shows a request for the extra data based on the pointer information is transmitted (column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 8, and column 9, lines 20-29).); and transmission means for transmitting the content meta information to the

information reception device based on the meta information reference ID (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data which is distributed from a headend or an independent service provider (column 7, lines 51-60)).

(Claim 59 discloses) the information distribution device according to claim 58, wherein the transmission means transmits the program information and the meta information reference ID over a network (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data over a network (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 60 discloses) the information distribution device according to claim 58, wherein the transmission means transmits the program information and the meta information reference ID over a broadcast wave (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data wirelessly (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 61 discloses) an information access device comprising: reception means for receiving program meta information and a meta information reference ID (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing device received the episode information and pointers (column 7, lines 1-8).); request means for requesting content meta information based on the meta information reference ID (Shoff et al shows additional related information is retrieved using the pointer (column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 8 and column 9, lines 20-29).); and display means for displaying the content meta information after reception (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit displays the requested information (column 7, lines 9-18 and column 10, lines 34-43)).

(Claim 62 discloses) the information access device according to claim 61, the wherein reception means receives the program meta information and the meta

information reference ID over a network (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data over a network (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 63 discloses) the information access device according to claim 61, wherein the reception means receives the program meta information and the meta information reference ID over a broadcast wave (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data wirelessly (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 64 discloses) the information access device according to claim 61, further comprising first content access means for making an access to address information of an entity of the content included in the content meta information (Shoff et al shows the data is retrieved using the information in the pointer (column 8, line 56 – column 9, line 8, and column 9, lines 20-29)).

(Claim 70 discloses) an information access method capable of distributing program meta information and a content with an interrelation established therebetween, the information access method comprising: transmitting the program meta information and a meta information reference ID from an information distribution device to an information reception device (Shoff et al shows transmitting the episode program guide information with pointers to the viewer computing unit (column 5, line 61 – column 6, line 6 and column 7, lines 1-8).); receiving the program meta information and the meta information reference ID from the information distribution device (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing device received the episode information and pointers (column 7, lines 1-8).); requesting content meta information to the information distribution device based on the received meta information reference ID (Shoff et al shows additional related

information is retrieved using the pointer (column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 8 and column 9, lines 20-29).); distributing the content meta information to the information reception device (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data which is distributed from a headend or an independent service provider (column 7, lines 51-60).); and displaying the content meta information acquired from the information distribution device (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit displays the requested information (column 7, lines 9-18 and column 10, lines 34-43)).

(Claim 71 discloses) the information access method according to claim 70, wherein the program meta information and the meta information reference ID are received over a network (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data over a network (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 72 discloses) the information access method according to claim 70, wherein the program meta information and the meta information reference ID are received over a broadcast wave (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data wirelessly (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 73 discloses) the information access method according to claim 70, wherein the content meta information received based on the meta information reference ID includes address information of an entity of the content (Shoff et al shows the pointers refer to the location of video data (column 5, line 61- column 6, line 6)).

(Claim 74 discloses) the information access method according to claim 73, wherein the content is accessed based on the address information of the entity of the

content (Shoff et al shows the data is retrieved using the information in the pointer (column 8, line 56 – column 9, line 8, and column 9, lines 20-29)).

(Claim 81 discloses) an information distribution method comprising transmitting program meta information and a meta information reference ID to an information reception device (Shoff et al shows transmitting the episode program guide information with pointers to the viewer computing unit (column 5, line 61 – column 6, line 6 and column 7, lines 1-8).), receiving a request for content meta information from the information reception device based on the meta information reference ID (Shoff et al shows a request for the extra data based on the pointer information is transmitted (column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 8, and column 9, lines 20-29).); and transmitting the content meta information to the information reception device based on the meta information reference ID (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data which is distributed from a headend or an independent service provider (column 7, lines 51-60)).

(Claim 82 discloses) the information distribution method according to claim 81, wherein the program meta information and the meta information reference ID are transmitted over a network (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data over a network (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 83 discloses) the information distribution method according to claim 81, wherein the program meta information and the meta information reference ID are transmitted over a broadcast wave (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data wirelessly (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 84 discloses) an information access method comprising receiving program meta information and a meta information reference ID (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing device received the episode information and pointers (column 7, lines 1-8).); requesting content meta information based on the meta information reference ID (Shoff et al shows additional related information is retrieved using the pointer (column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 8 and column 9, lines 20-29).); and receiving and displaying the content meta information (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit displays the requested information (column 7, lines 9-18 and column 10, lines 34-43)).

(Claim 85 discloses) the information access method according to claim 84, wherein the program meta information and the meta information reference ID are received over a network (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data over a network (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 86 discloses) the information access method according to claim 84, wherein the program meta information and the meta information reference ID are received over a broadcast wave (Shoff et al shows the viewer computing unit receives the data wirelessly (column 4, lines 43-55)).

(Claim 87 discloses) the information access method according to claim 84, wherein address information of an entity of a content included in the content meta information is accessed (Shoff et al shows the data is retrieved using the information in the pointer (column 8, line 56 – column 9, line 8, and column 9, lines 20-29)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 52, 53, 65, 66, 75, 76, 88, and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff et al (US Patent #6,240,555) in view of Goldthwaite et al (US Patent #7,363,591).

Claim 52 discloses the information access system according to claim 51, further comprising first analysis means for analyzing preference information from the content accessed by the first access means. Shoff et al teaches the limitations of claim 51 as recited above. It fails to teach analyzing preference information from the content accessed by the first access means. Goldthwaite et al teaches analyzing access information to obtain preference information (column 4, lines 46-67).

Shoff et al in view of Goldthwaite et al are analogous art because they are both related to electronic program guide management.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the analysis feature in Goldthwaite et al with the system in Shoff et al because users are provided with other relevant information on demand (Goldthwaite, column 4, lines 46-67).

Claim 53 discloses the information access system according to claim 52, wherein the content is searched based on the preference information. Goldthwaite et al further teaches choices are presented to a user based on a search using the user's preferences (column 4, lines 46-67)).

Claim 65 discloses the information access device according to claim 64, further comprising first analysis means for analyzing preference information derived by accessing the address information of the entity of the content. Shoff et al teaches the limitations of claim 64 as recited above. It fails to teach analyzing preference information derived by accessing the address information of the entity of the content. Goldthwaite et al teaches analyzing access information to obtain preference information (column 4, lines 46-67).

Shoff et al in view of Goldthwaite et al are analogous art because they are both related to electronic program guide management.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the analysis feature in Goldthwaite et al with the system in Shoff et

al because users are provided with other relevant information on demand (Goldthwaite, column 4, lines 46-67).

Claim 66 discloses the information access device according to claim 65, further comprising search means for searching the content based on the preference information. Goldthwaite et al further teaches choices are presented to a user based on a search using the user's preferences (column 4, lines 46-67)).

Claim 75 discloses the information access method according to claim 74, wherein preference information is analyzed from the accessed content. Shoff et al teaches the limitations of claim 74 as recited above. It fails to teach preference information is analyzed from the accessed content. Goldthwaite et al teaches analyzing access information to obtain preference information (column 4, lines 46-67).

Shoff et al in view of Goldthwaite et al are analogous art because they are both related to electronic program guide management.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the analysis feature in Goldthwaite et al with the system in Shoff et al because users are provided with other relevant information on demand (Goldthwaite, column 4, lines 46-67).

Claim 76 discloses the information access method according to claim 75, wherein the content is searched based on the preference information. Goldthwaite et al further teaches choices are presented to a user based on a search using the user's preferences (column 4, lines 46-67)).

Claim 88 discloses the information access method according to claim 87, wherein preference information derived by accessing the address information of the entity of the content is analyzed. Shoff et al teaches the limitations of claim 87 as recited above. It fails to teach preference information derived by accessing the address information of the entity of the content is analyzed. Goldthwaite et al teaches analyzing access information to obtain preference information (column 4, lines 46-67).

Shoff et al in view of Goldthwaite et al are analogous art because they are both related to electronic program guide management.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the analysis feature in Goldthwaite et al with the system in Shoff et al because users are provided with other relevant information on demand (Goldthwaite, column 4, lines 46-67).

Claim 89 discloses the information access method according to claim 88, wherein the content is searched based on the preference information. Goldthwaite et al further teaches choices are presented to a user based on a search using the user's preferences (column 4, lines 46-67)).

Claims 54, 55, 67, 77, 78, and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff et al (US Patent #6,240,555) in view of Beach et al (US PGPUB US2003/0014753).

Claim 54 discloses the information access system according to claim 47, wherein the content meta information is set with a keyword related to a program. Shoff et al teaches the limitations of claim 47 as recited above. It fails to teach the content meta

information is set with a keyword related to a program. Beach et al teaches the meta information has keywords which are related to the program information (paragraph 23).

Shoff et al and Beach et al are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the keyword feature in Beach et al with the system in Shoff et al because maximum serviceability is provided to the system's users (Beach, paragraph 24).

Claim 55 discloses the information access system according to claim 54, further comprising second content access means for making an access to the content related to the keyword based on the keyword. Beach et al further teaches a search based on keywords is provided (paragraph 24).

Claim 67 discloses the information access device according to claim 61, further comprising second content access means for making an access to the content based on a keyword relating to the content included in the content meta information. Shoff et al teaches the limitations of claim 61 as recited above. It fails to teach making an access to the content based on a keyword relating to the content included in the content meta information. Beach et al teaches the meta information has keywords which are related to the program information (paragraph 23) and a search based on keywords is provided (paragraph 24).

Shoff et al and Beach et al are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the keyword feature in Beach et al with the system in Shoff et al because maximum serviceability is provided to the system's users (Beach, paragraph 24).

Claim 77 discloses the information access method according to claim 70, wherein the content meta information is set with a keyword related to a program. Shoff et al teaches the limitations of claim 70 as recited above. It fails to teach the content meta information is set with a keyword related to a program. Beach et al teaches the meta information has keywords which are related to the program information (paragraph 23).

Shoff et al and Beach et al are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the keyword feature in Beach et al with the system in Shoff et al because maximum serviceability is provided to the system's users (Beach, paragraph 24).

Claim 78 discloses the information access method according to claim 77, wherein the content related to the keyword is searched based on the keyword. Beach et al further teaches a search based on keywords is provided (paragraph 24).

Claim 90 discloses the information access method according to claim 84, wherein the content is accessed based on a keyword related to the content included in the content meta information. Shoff et al teaches the limitations of claim 84 as recited

above. It fails to teach making an access to the content based on a keyword related to the content included in the content meta information. Beach et al teaches the meta information has keywords which are related to the program information (paragraph 23) and a search based on keywords is provided (paragraph 24).

Shoff et al and Beach et al are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the keyword feature in Beach et al with the system in Shoff et al because maximum serviceability is provided to the system's users (Beach, paragraph 24).

Claims 56, 68, 79, and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff et al (US Patent #6,240,555) in view of Beach et al (US PGPUB US2003/0014753) as applied to claims 55, 67, 78, and 90 above, and further in view of Shinkawa et al (US PGPUB US2001/0027557).

Claim 56 discloses the information access system according to claim 55, further comprising second analysis means for analyzing preference information from the content found by the search means based on the keyword. Shoff et al in view of Beach et al teaches the limitations of claim 55 as recited above. It fails to teach analyzing preference information from the content found by the search means based on the keyword. Shinkawa et al teaches keyword search information is stored for future searches (paragraph 28).

Shoff et al in view of Beach et al and Shinkawa et al are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the search storing feature in Shinkawa et al with the system in Shoff et al in view of Beach et al because a viewer is able to find information they want quickly and easily (Shinkawa, paragraph 29).

Claim 68 discloses the information access device according to claim 67, further comprising second analysis means for analyzing preference information of the content accessed based on the keyword. Shoff et al in view of Beach et al teaches the limitations of claim 67 as recited above. It fails to teach analyzing preference information of the content accessed based on the keyword. Shinkawa et al teaches keyword search information is stored for future searches (paragraph 28).

Shoff et al in view of Beach et al and Shinkawa et al are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the search storing feature in Shinkawa et al with the system in Shoff et al in view of Beach et al because a viewer is able to find information they want quickly and easily (Shinkawa, paragraph 29).

Claim 79 discloses the information access method according to claim 78, wherein preference information is analyzed from the content found based on the keyword. Shoff et al in view of Beach et al teaches the limitations of claim 78 as recited above. It fails to teach preference information is analyzed from the content found based

on the keyword. Shinkawa et al teaches keyword search information is stored for future searches (paragraph 28).

Shoff et al in view of Beach et al and Shinkawa et al are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the search storing feature in Shinkawa et al with the system in Shoff et al in view of Beach et al because a viewer is able to find information they want quickly and easily (Shinkawa, paragraph 29).

Claim 91 discloses the information access method according to claim 90, wherein preference information of the content accessed based on the keyword is analyzed. Shoff et al in view of Beach et al teaches the limitations of claim 90 as recited above. It fails to teach preference information of the content accessed based on the keyword is analyzed. Shinkawa et al teaches keyword search information is stored for future searches (paragraph 28).

Shoff et al in view of Beach et al and Shinkawa et al are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the search storing feature in Shinkawa et al with the system in Shoff et al in view of Beach et al because a viewer is able to find information they want quickly and easily (Shinkawa, paragraph 29).

Claims 57, 69, 80, and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff et al (US Patent #6,240,555) in view of Beach et al (US

PGPUB US2003/0014753) in view of Shinkawa et al (US PGPUB US2001/0027557) as applied to claims 56, 68, 79, and 91 above, and further in view of Heuvelman (US PGPUB US2003/0126600).

Claim 57 discloses the information access system according to claim 56, wherein the search means further comprises preference search means for searching the content based on the preference information. Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al teaches the limitations of claim 56 as recited above. It fails to teach the search means further comprises preference search means for searching the content based on the preference information. Heuvelman teaches searching for programs based on previously stored user preferences (paragraphs 63 and 64).

Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al and Heuvelman are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the search feature in Heuvelman with the system in Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al because user control of program selections increases and becomes user-friendly (Heuvelman, paragraph 4).

Claim 69 discloses the information access device according to claim 68, further comprising preference search means for searching the content based on the preference information. Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al teaches the limitations of claim 68 as recited above. It fails to teach the search means further comprises preference search means for searching the content based on the preference

information. Heuvelman teaches searching for programs based on previously stored user preferences (paragraphs 63 and 64).

Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al and Heuvelman are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the search feature in Heuvelman with the system in Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al because user control of program selections increases and becomes user-friendly (Heuvelman, paragraph 4).

Claim 80 discloses the information access method according to claim 79, wherein the content is searched based on the preference information. Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al teaches the limitations of claim 79 as recited above. It fails to teach the content is searched based on the preference information. Heuvelman teaches searching for programs based on previously stored user preferences (paragraphs 63 and 64).

Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al and Heuvelman are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the search feature in Heuvelman with the system in Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al because user control of program selections increases and becomes user-friendly (Heuvelman, paragraph 4).

Claim 92 discloses the information access method according to claim 91, wherein the content is searched based on the preference information. Shoff et al in

view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al teaches the limitations of claim 91 as recited above. It fails to teach the content is searched based on the preference information. Heuvelman teaches searching for programs based on previously stored user preferences (paragraphs 63 and 64).

Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al and Heuvelman are analogous art because they are both related to episode program guide managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the search feature in Heuvelman with the system in Shoff et al in view of Beach et al in view of Shinkawa et al because user control of program selections increases and becomes user-friendly (Heuvelman, paragraph 4).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Byrne et al (US Patent #5,990,883) teaches a unified presentation of programming from different physical sources.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Gillis whose telephone number is (571)272-7952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian J Gillis
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

/B. J. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 2141
8/13/2008

/saleh najjar/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2155